

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 7, 2007, claims 1, 5-8, 12-14, 17, 18, and 20 were presented for examination. Claims 18 and 20 were objected to as containing an informality. Claims 1, 5-7, 12-14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 8, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

The following remarks are provided in support of the pending claims and responsive to the Office Action of September 7, 2007 for the pending application.

I. Examiner Interview of October 12, 2007

In response to the Examiner's Interview Summary dated October 17, 2007, Applicants' Attorney hereby submits a summary of the interview.

On October 12, 2007, Applicants' Attorney and Examiner Scuderi met for a telephonic interview. There was no exhibit or demonstration of the invention provided. The claims discussed during the interview included outstanding claims 8, 12, and 13, as these are the only pending claims remaining with a prior art rejection. This interview took place following issuance of a Final Office Action and subsequent to submission of a response thereto. As such, a proposed amendment to these claims was discussed. More specifically, the proposed amendment discussed included adding limitations to claim 8 to include previously indicated allowable subject matter. Examiner Scuderi agreed that such an amendment may be entered after Final, as long as the amendment include the allowable subject matter present in the scope of at least one of the pending independent claims. Accordingly, an agreement on the scope of an amendment to claim 8 was reached by Applicants' Attorney and Examiner Scuderi.

II. Objection to claims 18 and 20

In the Office Action dated September 7, 2007, the Examiner objected to claims 18 and 20 as containing an informality. More specification, the Examiner objected to the use of the word "access" in the preamble of claim 18 since claim 18 is a method claim. Applicants have

amended claim 18, and more specifically replaced the word access with “accessing.” Claim 20 was objected to as being dependent on claim 18. Accordingly, based upon the amendment to claim 18, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to claims 18 and 20 and allowance thereof.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action dated September 7, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-7, 12-14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner identified the phrase “said node identifier of said requesting node” in line 13 as not having proper antecedent basis. Applicants have amended this phrase and replaced the first use of “said” in this identified phrase with the word “a.” Accordingly, there is now proper antecedent basis for the phrase identified in line 13 of claim 1.

With respect to claim 8, the Examiner identified the phrase “said node identifier of said requesting node” in line 12 as not having proper antecedent basis. Applicants have amended this phrase and replaced the first use of “said” in this identified phrase with the word “a.” Furthermore, Examiner indicated that the final clause of this claim should be amended to state that the manager allows access to the storage media. Such an amendment has been included. Accordingly, the elements of indefiniteness in this claim cited by the Examiner has been removed.

With respect to claims 12 and 13, both of these claims have been amended to recite the dependency from claim 10 to claim 8. Accordingly, removal of the rejections of these claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 14, the Examiner identified the phrase “shared storage media” in line 8 as being unclear. Applicants have amended line 4 to remove the word “shared,” and have amended line 8 to remove both uses of the word “shared.” In addition, in line 13, the Examiner

identified the phrase “said node identifier of said requesting node” as not having proper antecedent basis. Applicants have replaced the phrase “said node identifier of said requesting node to said node” with the phrase “a node identifier of said requesting node to a node.” Finally, the Examiner raised a rejection to the final line of claim 14. Applicants have amended this line of the claim in compliance with the structure of the article claim. Accordingly, Applicants have addressed each of the itemized elements of the rejection, and respectfully request removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and allowance of claims 1, 5-7, 12-14, and 17.

IV. Rejection of claims 8, 12, and 13

In the Office Action dated September 7, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Imamura*, U.S. Patent No. 6,453,369.

Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to include the limitations of claim 1. It has been determined by the Examiner that the limitations of claim 1 are not met in *Imamura* ‘369. Based upon the amendment presented herein in compliance with the Examiner Interview of October 12, 2007, it is Applicants’ position that the rejection set forth herein under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejection of claims 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

V. Conclusion

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. No new subject matter has been added to the application with the amendment to the claims presented herewith.

Furthermore, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner indicate allowability of claims 1, 5-8, 12-14, 17-18, and 20, and that the application pass to issue. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the

undersigned at the number provided.

For the reasons outlined above, withdrawal of the rejection of record and an allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Rochelle Lieberman/
Rochelle Lieberman
Registration No. 39,276
Attorney for Applicants

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC
802 Still Creek Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 948-7775
Fax: (301) 948-7774
Email: rocky@legalplanner.com

Date: November 7, 2007